arXiv:1510.06452v4 [cs.DS] 18 Jul 2016

Subquadratic Algorithms for Succinct Stable Matching

Daniel Moeller* Ramamohan Paturi*† Stefan Schneider†

Department of Computer Science and Engineering
UC, San Diego
La Jolla, CA 92093

July 19, 2016

Abstract

We consider the stable matching problem when the preference lists are not given explicitly but are represented in a succinct way and ask whether the problem becomes computationally easier. We give subquadratic algorithms for finding a stable matching in special cases of two very natural succinct representations of the problem, the d-attribute and d-list models. We also give algorithms for verifying a stable matching in the same models. We further show that for $d = \omega(\log n)$ both finding and verifying a stable matching in the d-attribute model requires quadratic time assuming the Strong Exponential Time Hypothesis. The d-attribute model is therefore as hard as the general case for large enough values of d.

1 Introduction

The stable matching problem has applications that vary from coordinating buyers and sellers to assigning students to public schools and residents to hospitals [16, 21, 27]. Gale and Shapley [14] proposed a quadratic time *deferred acceptance* algorithm for this problem which has helped clear matching markets in many real-world settings. For arbitrary preferences, the deferred acceptance algorithm is optimal and even verifying that a given matching is stable requires quadratic time [24, 28, 15]. This is reasonable since representing all participants' preferences requires quadratic space. However, in many applications the preferences are not arbitrary and can have more structure. For example, top doctors are likely to be universally desired by residency programs and students typically seek highly ranked schools. In these cases participants can represent their preferences succinctly. It is natural to ask whether the same quadratic time bounds apply with compact and structured preference models that have subquadratic representations. This will provide a more nuanced understanding of where the complexity lies: Is stable matching inherently complex, or is the complexity merely a result of the large variety of possible preferences? To this end, we examine two restricted preference models originally proposed by Bhatnagar et al. [7], the d-attribute and d-list models. Using a wide range of techniques we provide algorithms and conditional hardness results for several settings of these models.

*This research was partially supported by the Army Research Office grant number W911NF-15-1-0253.

†This research is supported by NSF grant CCF-1213151 from the Division of Computing and Communication Foundations. Any opinions, findings and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation. The final publication is available at Springer via http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-34171-2_21

In the *d-attribute* model, we assume that there are d different attributes (e.g. income, height, sense of humor, etc.) with a fixed, possibly objective, ranking of the men for each attribute. Each woman's preference list is based on a linear combination of the attributes of the men, where each woman can have different weights for each attribute. Some women may care more about, say, height whereas others care more about sense of humor. Men's preferences are defined analogously. This model is applicable in large settings, such as online dating systems, where participants lack the resources to form an opinion of every other participant. Instead the system can rank the members of each gender according to the d attributes and each participant simply needs to provide personalized weights for the attributes. The combination of attribute values and weights implicitly represents the entire preference matrix. Bogomolnaia and Laslier [8] show that representing all possible $n \times n$ preference matrices requires $n - 1$ attributes. Therefore it is reasonable to expect that when $d \ll n - 1$, we could beat the worst case quadratic lower bounds for the general stable matching problem.

In the *d-list* model, we assume that there are d different rankings of the men. Each women selects one of the d lists as her preference list. Similarly, each man chooses one of d lists of women as his preference list. This model captures the setting where members of one group (i.e. student athletes, sorority members, engineering majors) may all have identical preference lists. Mathematically, this model is actually a special case of the d-attribute model where each participant places a positive weight on exactly one attribute. However, its motivation is distinct and we can achieve improved results for this model.

Chebolu et al. prove that approximately counting stable matchings in the d-attribute model for $d \geq 3$ is as hard as the general case [11]. Bhatnagar et al. showed that sampling stable matchings using random walks can take exponential time even for a small number of attributes or lists but left it as an open question whether subquadratic algorithms exist for these models [7].

We show that faster algorithms exist for finding a stable matching in some special cases of these models. In particular, we provide subquadratic algorithms for the d-attribute model, where all values and weights are from a small set, and the one-sided d-attribute model, where one side of the market has only one attribute. These results show we can achieve meaningful improvement over the general setting for some restricted preferences.

While we only provide subquadratic algorithms to find stable matchings in special cases of the attribute model, we have stronger results concerning verification of stable matchings. We demonstrate optimal subquadratic stability testing algorithms for the d-list and boolean d-attribute settings as well as a subquadratic algorithm for the general d-attribute model with constant d. These algorithms provide a clear distinction between the attribute model and the general setting. Moreover, these results raise the question of whether verifying and finding a stable matching are equally hard problems for these restricted models, as both require quadratic time in the general case.

Finally, we show that the stable matching problem in the d-attribute model for $d = \omega(\log n)$ cannot be solved in subquadratic time under the Strong Exponential Time Hypothesis (SETH) [18, 20]. We show SETH-hardness for both finding and verifying a stable matching, even if the weights and attributes are boolean. This adds the stable matching problem to a growing list of SETH-hard problems, including Fréchet distance [9], edit distance [5], string matching [1], k-dominating set [25], orthogonal vectors [30], model checking on sparse graphs [10], and vector domination [19]. Thus the quadratic time hardness of the stable matching problem in the general case extends to the more restricted and succinct d-attribute model. This limits the space of models where we can hope to find subquadratic algorithms.

Dabney and Dean [12] study an alternative succinct preference representation where there is a canonical preference list for each side and individual deviations from this list are specified separately.

They provide an adaptive $O(n+k)$ time algorithm for the special one-sided case, where k is the number of deviations. Bartholdi and Trick [6] present a subquadratic time algorithm for stable roommates with narcissistic, single-peaked preferences. Arkin et al. [4] derive a subquadratic algorithm for stable roommates with constant dimensional geometric preferences.

2 Summary of Results

Section 4.1 gives an $O(C^{2d}n(d+\log n))$ time algorithm for finding a stable matching in the d-attribute model if both the attributes and weights are from a set of size at most C. This gives a strongly subquadratic algorithm (i.e. $O(n^{2-\varepsilon})$ for $\varepsilon > 0$) if $d < \frac{1}{2\log C}\log n$.

Section 4.2 considers an asymmetric case, where one side of the matching market has d attributes, while the other side has a single attribute. We allow both the weights and attributes to be arbitrary real values. Our algorithm for finding a stable matching in this model has time complexity $\tilde{O}(n^{2-1/\lfloor d/2 \rfloor})$, which is strongly subquadratic for constant d.

In Section 5.1 we consider the problem of verifying that a given matching is stable in the d-attribute model with real attributes and weights. The time complexity of our algorithm is $\tilde{O}(n^{2-1/2d})$, which is again strongly subquadratic for constant d.

Section 5.2 gives an $O(dn)$ time algorithm for verifying a stable matching in the d-list model. This is linear in its input size and is therefore optimal.

In Section 5.3 we give a randomized $\tilde{O}(n^{2-1/O(c\log^2(c))})$ time algorithm for $d = c\log n$ for verifying a stable matching in the d-attribute model when both the weights and attributes are boolean. This algorithm is strongly subquadratic for $d = O(\log n)$.

Finally, in Section 6 we give a conditional lower bound for both finding and verifying a stable matching in the d-attribute model. We show that there is no strongly subquadratic algorithm when $d = \omega(\log n)$ assuming the Strong Exponential Time Hypothesis.

3 Preliminaries

A *matching market* consists of a set of men M and a set of women W with $|M| = |W| = n$. We further have a permutation of W for every $m \in M$, and a permutation of M for every $w \in W$, called *preference lists*. Note that representing a general matching market requires size $\Omega(n^2)$.

For a perfect bipartite matching μ, a *blocking pair* with respect to μ is a pair $(m,w) \notin \mu$ where $m \in M$ and $w \in W$, such that w appears before $\mu(m)$ in m's preference list and m appears before $\mu(w)$ in w's preference list. A perfect bipartite matching is called *stable* if there are no blocking pairs. In settings where ties in the preference lists are possible, we consider weakly stable matchings where (m,w) is a blocking pair if and only if both strictly prefer each other to their partner.

Gale and Shapley's deferred acceptance algorithm [14] works as follows. While there is an unmatched man m, have m *propose* to his most preferred woman who has not already rejected him. A woman accepts a proposal if she is unmatched or if she prefers the proposing man to her current partner, leaving her current partner unmatched. Otherwise, she rejects the proposal. This process finds a stable matching in time $O(n^2)$.

A matching market in the d-attribute model consists of n men and n women as before. A participant p has attributes $A_i(p)$ for $1 \le i \le d$ and weights $\alpha_i(p)$ for $1 \le i \le d$. For a man m and woman w, m's *value* of w is given by $\mathrm{val}_m(w) = \langle \alpha(m), A(w) \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \alpha_i(m)A_i(w)$. m ranks the women in decreasing order of value. Symmetrically, w's value of m is $\mathrm{val}_w(m) = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \alpha_i(w)A_i(m)$. Note that representing a matching market in the d-attribute model requires size $O(dn)$. Unless otherwise specified, both attributes and weights can be negative.

A matching market in the d-list model is a matching market where both sides have at most d distinct preference lists. Describing a matching market in this model requires $O(dn)$ numbers.

Throughout the paper, we use $\tilde{O}$ to suppress polylogarithmic factors in the time complexity.

4 Finding Stable Matchings

4.1 Small Set of Attributes and Weights

We first present a stable matching algorithm for the d-attribute model when the attribute and weight values are limited to a set of constant size. In particular, we assume that the number of possible values for each attribute and weight for all participants is bounded by a constant C.

Algorithm 1: Small Constant Attributes and Weights

```
Group the women into sets S_i with a set for each of the C' = O(C^{2d}) types of women.
(O(C^d) possible attribute values and O(C^d) possible weight vectors.)
Associate an empty min-heap h_i with each set S_i.
for each man m do
    Create m's preference list of sets S_i.
    index(m) ← 1
while there is a man m who is not in any heap do
    Let S_i be the index(m) set on m's list.
    if |h_i| < |S_i| then
        h_i.insert(m)
    else
        if val_{S_i}(m) > val_{S_i}(h_i.min) then
            h_i.delete_min()
            h_i.insert(m)
    index(m) ← index(m) + 1
for i = 1 to C' do
    μ ← μ ⋃ Arbitrarily pair women in S_i with men in h_i.
return μ
```

Theorem 1. *There is an algorithm to find a stable matching in the d-attribute model with at most a constant C distinct attribute and weight values in time $O(C^{2d}n(d + \log n))$.*

Proof. Consider Algorithm 1. First observe that each man is indifferent between the women in a given set S_i because each woman has identical attribute values. Moreover, the women in a set S_i share the same ranking of the men, since they have identical weight vectors. Therefore, since we are looking for a stable matching, we can treat each set of women S_i as an individual entity in a many to one matching where the capacity for each S_i is the number of women it contains.

With these observations, the stability follows directly from the stability of the standard deferred acceptance algorithm for many-one stable matching. Indeed, each man proposes to the sets of women in the order of his preferences and each set of women tentatively accepts the best proposals, holding onto no more than the available capacity.

The grouping of the women requires $O(C^{2d} + dn)$ time to initialize the groups and place each woman in the appropriate group. Creating the men's preference lists requires $O(dC^{2d}n)$ time to evaluate and sort the groups of women for every man. The while loop requires $O(C^{2d}n(d + \log n))$ time since each man will propose to at most C^{2d} sets of women and each proposal requires

$O(d + \log n)$ time to evaluate and update the heap. This results in an overall running time of $O(C^{2d} n(d + \log n))$. □

As long as $d < \frac{1}{2 \log C} \log n$, the time complexity in Theorem 1 will be subquadratic. It is worth noting that the algorithm and proof actually do not rely on any restriction of the men's attribute and weight values. Thus, this result holds whenever one side's attributes and weight values come from a set of constant size.

4.2 One-Sided Real Attributes

In this section we consider a one-sided attribute model with real attributes and weights. In this model, women have d attributes and men have d weights, and the preference list of a man is given by the weighted sum of the women's attributes as in the two-sided attribute model. On the other hand there is only one attribute for the men. The women's preferences are thus determined by whether they have a positive or negative weight on this attribute. For simplicity, we first assume that all women have a positive weight on the men's attribute and show a subquadratic algorithm for this case. Then we extend it to allow for negative weights.

To find a stable matching when the women have a global preference list over the men, we use a greedy approach: process the men from the most preferred to the least preferred and match each man with the highest unmatched woman in his preference list. This general technique is not specific to the attribute model but actually works for any market where one side has a single global preference list. (e.g. [12] uses a similar approach for their algorithm.) The complexity lies in repeatedly finding which of the available women is most preferred by the current top man.

This leads us to the following algorithm: for every woman w consider a point with $A(w)$ as its coordinates and organize the set of points into a data structure. Then, for the men in order of preference, query the set of points against a direction vector consisting of the man's weight and find the point with the largest distance along this direction. Remove that point and repeat.

The problem of finding a maximal point along a direction is typically considered in its dual setting, where it is called the *ray shooting problem*. In the ray shooting problem we are given n hyperplanes and must maintain a data structure to answer queries. Each query consists of a vertical ray and the data structure returns the first hyperplane hit by that ray.

The relevant results are in Lemma 1 which follows from several papers for different values of d. For an overview of the ray shooting problem and related range query problems, see [2].

Lemma 1 ([17, 13, 23])**.** *Given an n point set in $\mathbb{R}^d$ for $d \geq 2$, there is a data structure for ray shooting queries with preprocessing time $\tilde{O}(n)$ and query time $\tilde{O}(n^{1-1/\lfloor d/2 \rfloor})$. The structure supports deletions with amortized update time $\tilde{O}(1)$.*

For $d = 1$, queries can trivially be answered in constant time. We use this data structure to provide an algorithm when there is a global list for one side of the market.

Lemma 2. *For $d \geq 2$ there is an algorithm to find a stable matching in the one-sided d-attribute model with real-valued attributes and weights in time $\tilde{O}(n^{2-1/\lfloor d/2 \rfloor})$ when there is a single preference list for the other side of the market.*

Proof. For a man m, let $\dim(m)$ denote the index of the last non-zero weight, i.e. $\alpha_{\dim(m)+1}(m) = \cdots = \alpha_d(m) = 0$. We assume $\dim(m) > 0$, as otherwise m is indifferent among all women and we can pick any woman as $\mu(m)$. We assume without loss of generality $\alpha_{\dim(m)}(m) \in \{-1, 1\}$. For

each d' such that $1 \leq d' \leq d$ we build a data structure consisting of n hyperplanes in $\mathbb{R}^{d'}$. For each woman w, consider the hyperplanes

$$H_{d'}(w) = \left\{ x_{d'} = \sum_{i=1}^{d'-1} A_i(w)x_i - A_{d'}(w) \right\} \tag{1}$$

and for each d' preprocess the set of all hyperplanes according to Lemma 1. Note that $H_{d'}(w)$ is the dual of the point $(A_1(w), \ldots, A_{d'}(w))$.

For a man m we can find his most preferred partner by querying the $\dim(m)$-dimensional data structure. Let $s = \alpha_{\dim(m)}(m)$. Consider a ray $r(m) \in \mathbb{R}^{\dim(m)}$ originating at

$$(-\frac{\alpha_1(m)}{s}, \ldots, -\frac{\alpha_{\dim(m)-1}(m)}{s}, -s \cdot \infty) \tag{2}$$

in the direction $(0, \ldots, 0, s)$. If $\alpha_{\dim(m)} = 1$ we find the lowest hyperplane intersecting the ray, and if $\alpha_{\dim(m)} = -1$ we find the highest hyperplane. We claim that the first hyperplane $r(m)$ hits corresponds to m's most preferred woman. Let woman w be preferred over woman w', i.e. $\text{val}_m(w) = \sum_{i=1}^{\dim(m)} A_i(w)\alpha_i(m) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{\dim(m)} A_i(w')\alpha_i(m) = \text{val}_m(w')$. Since the ray $r(m)$ is vertical in coordinate $x_{d'}$, it is sufficient to evaluate the right-hand side of the definition in equation 1. Indeed we have $\text{val}_m(w) \geq \text{val}_m(w')$ if and only if

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\dim(m)-1} -A_i(w)\frac{\alpha_i(m)}{s} - A_{\dim(m)}(w) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\dim(m)-1} -A_i(w')\frac{\alpha_i(m)}{s} - A_{\dim(m)}(w') \tag{3}$$

when $s = 1$ and

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\dim(m)-1} -A_i(w)\frac{\alpha_i(m)}{s} - A_{\dim(m)}(w) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{\dim(m)-1} -A_i(w')\frac{\alpha_i(m)}{s} - A_{\dim(m)}(w') \tag{4}$$

when $s = -1$.

Note that the query ray is dual to the set of hyperplanes with normal vector $(\alpha_1(m), \ldots, \alpha_d(m))$.

Now we pick the highest man m in the (global) preference list, consider the ray as above and find the first hyperplane $H_{\dim(m)}(w)$ hit by the ray. We then match the pair (m, w), remove $H(w)$ from all data structures and repeat. Correctness follows from the correctness of the greedy approach when all women share the same preference list and the properties of the halfspaces proved above.

The algorithm preprocesses d data structures, then makes n queries and dn deletions. The time is dominated by the n ray queries each requiring time $\tilde{O}(n^{1-1/\lfloor d/2 \rfloor})$. Thus the total time complexity is bounded by $\tilde{O}(n^{2-1/\lfloor d/2 \rfloor})$, as claimed. □

Algorithm 2: One-Sided Stable Matching

// For points in $P \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we use the notation $(x_1, \ldots, x_d)$ to refer to its coordinates.
Input: matching μ
for $d' = 1$ *to* d **do**
  for *each woman* w **do**
    $H(w) \leftarrow \{x_d = \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} A_i(w)x_i - A_{d'}(w)\}$
    $H_{d'} \leftarrow H_{d'} \cup H(w)$
  $H_{d'}$.preprocess()
for *each man* m *in order of preference* **do**
  $s \leftarrow \alpha_{\dim(m)}(m)$
  $r(m) \leftarrow (-\frac{\alpha_1(m)}{s}, \ldots, -\frac{\alpha_{\dim(m)-1}(m)}{s}, \infty \cdot s) + t \cdot (0, \ldots, 0, -s)$
  $H(w) \leftarrow \text{Query}(H_{\dim(m)}, r(m))$
  $\mu \leftarrow \mu \cup (m, w)$
  for $d' = 1$ *to* d **do**
    $H_{d'} \leftarrow H_{d'} - H_{d'}(w)$
return μ

We use the following lemma to extend the above algorithm to account for positive and negative weights for the women. It deals with settings where the women choose one of two lists (σ_1, σ_2) as their preference lists over the men while the men's preferences can be arbitrary.

Lemma 3. *Suppose there are k women who use σ_1. If the top k men in σ_1 are in the bottom k places in σ_2, then the women using σ_1 will only match with those men and the $n-k$ women using σ_2 will only match with the other $n-k$ men in the woman-optimal stable matching.*

Proof. Consider the operation of the woman-proposing deferred acceptance algorithm for finding the woman-optimal stable matching. Suppose the lemma is false so that at some point a woman using σ_1 proposed to one of the last $n-k$ men in σ_1. Let w be the first such woman. w must have been rejected by all of the top k, so at least one of those men received a proposal from a woman, w', using σ_2. However, since the top k men in σ_1 are the bottom k men in σ_2, w' must have been rejected by all of the top $n-k$ men in σ_2. But there are only $n-k$ women using σ_2, so one of the top $n-k$ men in σ_2 must have already received a proposal from a woman using σ_1. This is a contradiction because w was the first woman using σ_1 to propose to one of the bottom $n-k$ men in σ_1 (which are the top $n-k$ men in σ_2). □

We can now prove the following theorem where negative values are allowed for the women's weights.

Theorem 2. *For $d \geq 2$ there is an algorithm to find a stable matching in the one-sided d-attribute model with real-valued attributes and weights in time $\tilde{O}(n^{2-1/\lfloor d/2 \rfloor})$.*

Proof. Suppose there are k women who have a positive weight on the men's attribute. Since the remaining $n-k$ women's preference list is the reverse, we can use Lemma 3 to split the problem into two subproblems. Namely, in the woman-optimal stable matching the k women with a positive weight will match with the top k men, and the $n-k$ women with a negative weight will match with the bottom $n-k$ men. Now the women in each of these subproblems all have the same list. Therefore we can use Lemma 2 to solve each subproblem. Splitting the problem into subproblems can be done in time $O(n)$ so the running time follows immediately from Lemma 2. □

Table 1: Preference lists where a greedy approach will not work

σ_1	σ_2	π_1	π_2
m_1	m_3	w_1	w_3
m_2	m_5	w_2	w_5
m_3	m_1	w_3	w_1
m_4	m_4	w_4	w_4
m_5	m_2	w_5	w_2

Man	List	Woman	List
m_1	π_1	w_1	σ_2
m_2	π_1	w_2	σ_2
m_3	π_2	w_3	σ_1
m_4	π_1	w_4	σ_2
m_5	π_2	w_5	σ_1

As a remark, this "greedy" approach where we select a man, find his most preferred available woman, and permanently match him to her will not work in general. Table 1 describes a simple 2-list example where the unique stable matching is $(m_1w_2, m_2w_3, m_3w_5, m_4w_4, m_5w_1)$. In this instance, no participant is matched with their top choice. Therefore, the above approach cannot work for this instance. This illustrates to some extent why the general case seems more difficult than the one-sided case.

5 Verification

We now turn to the problem of verifying whether a given matching is stable. While this is as hard as finding a stable matching in the general setting, the verification algorithms we present here are more efficient than our algorithms for finding stable matchings in the attribute model.

5.1 Real Attributes and Weights

In this section we adapt the geometric approach for finding a stable matching in the one-sided d-attribute model to the problem of verifying a stable matching in the (two-sided) d-attribute model. We express the verification problem as a *simplex range searching problem* in $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$, which is the dual of the ray shooting problem. In simplex range searching we are given n points and answer queries that ask for the number of points inside a simplex. In our case we only need degenerate simplices consisting of the intersection of two halfspaces. Simplex range searching queries can be done in sublinear time for constant d.

Lemma 4 ([22])**.** *Given a set of n points in $\mathbb{R}^d$, one can process it for simplex range searching in time $O(n \log n)$, and then answer queries in time $\tilde{O}(n^{1-\frac{1}{d}})$.*

For $1 \leq d' \leq d$ we use the notation $(x_1, \ldots, x_d, y_1, \ldots, y_{d'-1}, z)$ for points in $\mathbb{R}^{d+d'}$. We again let $\dim(w)$ be the index of w's last non-zero weight, assume without loss of generality $\alpha_{\dim(w)} \in \{-1, 1\}$, and let $\mathrm{sgn}(w) = \mathrm{sgn}(\alpha_{\dim(w)})$. We partition the set of women into $2d$ sets $W_{d',s}$ for $1 \leq d' \leq d$ and $s \in \{-1, 1\}$ based on $\dim(w)$ and $\mathrm{sgn}(w)$. Note that if $\dim(w) = 0$, then w is indifferent among all men and can therefore not be part of a blocking pair. We can ignore such women.

For a woman w, consider the point

$$P(w) = (A_1(w), \ldots, A_d(w), \alpha_1(w), \ldots, \alpha_{\dim(w)-1}(w), \mathrm{val}_w(m)) \tag{5}$$

where $m = \mu(w)$ is the partner of w in the input matching μ. For a set $W_{d',s}$ we let $P_{d',s}$ be the set of points $P(w)$ for $w \in W_{d',s}$. The basic idea is to construct a simplex for every man and query it against all sets $P_{d',s}$.

Given d',s, and a man m, let $H_1(m)$ be the halfspace $\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{d} \alpha_i(m)x_i > \text{val}_m(w)\right\}$ where $w = \mu(m)$. For $w' \in W_{d',s}$ we have $P(w') \in H_1(m)$ if and only if m strictly prefers w' to w. Further let $H_2(m)$ be the halfspace $\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{d'-1} A_i(m)y_i + A_{d'}(m)s > z\right\}$. For $w' \in W_{d',s}$ we have $P(w') \in H_2(m)$ if and only if w' strictly prefers m to $\mu(w')$. Hence (m, w') is a blocking pair if and only if $P(w') \in H_1(m) \cap H_2(m)$.

Using Lemma 4 we immediately have an algorithm to verify a stable matching.

Theorem 3. *There is an algorithm to verify a stable matching in the d-attribute model with real-valued attributes and weights in time $\tilde{O}(n^{2-1/2d})$*

Proof. Partition the set of women into sets $W_{d',s}$ for $1 \le d' \le d$ and $s \in \{-1, 1\}$ and for $w \in W_{d',s}$ construct $P(w) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+d'}$ as above. Then preprocess the sets according to Lemma 4. For each man m query $H_1(m) \cap H_2(m)$ against the points in all sets. By the definitions of $H_1(m)$ and $H_2(m)$, there is a blocking pair if and only if for some man m there is a point $P(w) \in H_1(m) \cap H_2(m)$ in one of the sets $P_{d',s}$.

The time to preprocess is $O(n \log n)$. There are $2dn$ queries of time $\tilde{O}(n^{1-1/2d})$. Hence the whole process requires time $\tilde{O}(n^{2-1/2d})$ as claimed. □

Algorithm 3: Verify Stable Matching with Reals

```
// For points in P ∈ R^{d+d'} we use the notation (x_1, ..., x_d, y_1, ..., y_{d'-1}, z) to refer to its coordinates.
Input: matching μ
for each woman w do
    m ← μ(w)
    P(w) ← (A_1(w), ..., A_d(w), α_1(w), ..., α_d(w), val_w(m))
    P_{dim(w),sgn(w)} ← W_{dim(w),sgn(w)} ∪ P(w)
for d' = 1 to d and s ∈ {-1, 1} do
    P_{d',s}.preprocess()
    for each man m do
        w ← μ(m)
        H_1(m) ← {Σ_{i=1}^{d} α_i(m)x_i > val_m(w)}
        H_2(m) ← {Σ_{i=1}^{d'-1} A_i(m)y_i + A_{d'}(m)·s > z}
        if Query(P_{d',s}, H_1(m) ∩ H_2(m)) > 0 then
            return μ is not stable
return μ is stable
```

5.2 Lists

When there are d preference orders for each side, and each participant uses one of the d lists, we provide a more efficient algorithm. Here, assume μ is the given matching between M and W. Let $\{\pi_i\}_{i=1}^{d}$ be the set of d permutations on the women and $\{\sigma_i\}_{i=1}^{d}$ be the set of d permutations on the men. Define $\text{rank}(w, i)$ to be the position of w in permutation π_i. This can be determined in constant time after $O(dn)$ preprocessing of the permutations. Let $\text{head}(\pi_i, j)$ be the first woman in π_i who uses permutation σ_j and $\text{next}(w, i)$ be the next highest ranked woman after w in permutation π_i who uses the same permutation as w or $\perp$ if no such woman exists. These can also be determined in constant time after $O(dn)$ preprocessing by splitting the lists into sublists, with one sublist for the

women using each permutation of men. The functions rank, head, and next are defined analogously for the men.

Algorithm 4: Verify d-List Stable Matching

```
for i = 1 to d do
    for j = 1 to d do
        w ← head(π_i, j).
        m ← head(σ_j, i).
        while m ≠ ⊥ and w ≠ ⊥ do
            if rank(w, i) > rank(μ(m), i) then
                m ← next(m, j).
            else
                if rank(m, j) > rank(μ(w), j) then
                    w ← next(w, i).
                else
                    return (m, w) is a blocking pair.
return μ is stable.
```

Theorem 4. *There is an algorithm to verify a stable matching in the d-list model in $O(dn)$ time.*

Proof. We claim that algorithm 4 satisfies the theorem. Indeed, if the algorithm returns a pair (m, w) where m uses π_i and w uses σ_j, then (m, w) is a blocking pair because w appears earlier in π_i than $\mu(m)$ and m appears earlier in σ_j than $\mu(w)$.

On the other hand, suppose the algorithm returns that μ is stable but there is a blocking pair, (m, w), where m uses π_i and w uses σ_j. The algorithm considers permutations π_i and σ_j since it does not terminate early. Clearly if the algorithm evaluates m and w simultaneously when considering permutations π_i and σ_j, it will detect that (m, w) is a blocking pair. Therefore, the algorithm either moves from m to $\text{next}(m, j)$ before considering w or it moves from w to $\text{next}(w, i)$ before considering m. In the former case, $\text{rank}(\mu(m), i) < \text{rank}(w', i)$ for some w' that comes before w in π_i. Therefore m prefers $\mu(m)$ to w. Similarly, in the latter case, $\text{rank}(\mu(w), j) < \text{rank}(m', i)$ for some m' that comes before m in σ_j so w prefers $\mu(w)$ to m. Thus (m, w) is not a blocking pair and we have a contradiction.

The **for** and **while** loops proceed through all men and women once for each of the d lists in which they appear. Since at each step we are either proceeding to the next man or the next woman unless we find a blocking pair, the algorithm requires time $O(dn)$. This is optimal since the input size is dn. □

5.3 Boolean Attributes and Weights

In this section we consider the problem of verifying a stable matching when the d attributes and weights are restricted to boolean values and $d = c \log n$. The algorithm closely follows an algorithm for the maximum inner product problem by Alman and Williams [3]. The idea is to express the existence of a blocking pair as a probabilistic polynomial with a bounded number of monomials and use fast rectangular matrix multiplication to evaluate it. A probabilistic polynomial for a function f is a polynomial p such that for every input x

$$\Pr[f(x) \neq p(x)] \leq \frac{1}{3} \tag{6}$$

We use the following tools in our algorithm. THR_d is the threshold function that outputs 1 if at least d of its inputs are 1.

Lemma 5 ([3])**.** *There is a probabilistic polynomial for* THR_d *on* n *variables and error* ε *with degree* $O(\sqrt{n\log(1/\varepsilon)})$.

Lemma 6 ([26, 29])**.** *There is a probabilistic polynomial for the disjunction of* n *variables and error* ε *with degree* $O(\log(1/\varepsilon))$

Lemma 7 ([31])**.** *Given a polynomial* $P(x_1,\ldots,x_m,y_1,\ldots y_m)$ *with at most* $n^{0.17}$ *monomials and two sets* $X,Y\subseteq\{0,1\}^m$ *with* $|X|=|Y|=n$*, we can evaluate* P *on all pairs* $(x,y)\in X\times Y$ *in time* $\tilde{O}(n^2+m\cdot n^{1.17})$.

We construct a probabilistic polynomial that outputs 1 if there is a blocking pair. To minimize the degree of the polynomial, we pick a parameter s and divide the men and women into sets of size at most s. The polynomial takes the description of s men $m_1,\ldots,m_s$ and s women $w_1,\ldots,w_s$ along with their respective partners as input, and outputs 1 if and only if there is a blocking pair (m_i,w_j) among the s^2 pairs of nodes with high probability.

Lemma 8. *Let* u *be a large constant and* $s=n^{1/uc\log^2 c}$*. There is a probabilistic polynomial with the following inputs:*

- *The attributes and weights of* s *men,* $A(m_1),\ldots,A(m_s),\alpha(m_1),\ldots,\alpha(m_s)$
- *The attributes of the* s *women that are matched with these men* $A(\mu(m_1)),\ldots,A(\mu(m_s))$
- *The attributes and weights of* s *women,* $A(w_1),\ldots,A(w_s),\alpha(w_1),\ldots,\alpha(w_s)$
- *The attributes of the* s *men that are matched with these women* $A(\mu(w_1)),\ldots,A(\mu(w_s))$

The output of the polynomial is 1 *if and only if there is a blocking pair with respect to the matching* μ *among the* s^2 *pairs in the input. The number of monomials is at most* $n^{0.17}$ *and the polynomial can be constructed efficiently.*

Proof. A pair (m_i,w_j) is a blocking pair if and only if $\langle\alpha(m_i),A(\mu(m_i))\rangle<\langle\alpha(m_i),A(w_j)\rangle$ and $\langle\alpha(w_j),A(\mu(w_j))\rangle<\langle\alpha(w_j),A(m_i)\rangle$. Rewriting

$$F(x,y,a,b):=\langle x,y\rangle<\langle a,b\rangle=\mathrm{THR}_{d+1}\left(\neg(x_1\wedge y_1),\ldots,\neg(x_d\wedge y_d),a_1\wedge b_1,\ldots,a_d\wedge b_d\right)\tag{7}$$

we have a blocking pair if and only if

$$\bigvee_{\substack{i\in[1,s]\\ j\in[1,s]}}\left(F(\alpha(m_i),A(\mu(m_i)),\alpha(m_i),A(w_j))\wedge F(\alpha(w_j),A(\mu(w_j)),\alpha(w_j),A(m_i))\right)\tag{8}$$

Note that we can easily adapt this algorithm to finding strongly blocking pairs by defining $F(x,y,a,b)$ as $\langle x,y\rangle\leq\langle a,b\rangle$.

Using Lemma 5 with $\varepsilon=\frac{1}{s^3}$ and Lemma 6 with $\varepsilon=1/4$ we get a probabilistic polynomial of degree $a\sqrt{d\log s}$ for some constant a and error $1/4+1/s<1/3$. Furthermore, since we are only interested in boolean inputs we can assume the polynomial to be multilinear. For large enough u we have $2d>a\sqrt{d\log(s)}$ (i.e. the degree is at most half of the number of variables) and the number of monomials is then bounded by $O\left(\left(s^2\binom{4d}{a\sqrt{d\log(s)}}\right)^2\right)$.

Simplifying the binomial coefficient we have

$$\binom{4d}{a\sqrt{d\log s}} = \binom{4c\log n}{a\sqrt{(\log^2 n)/u\log^2 c}} = \binom{4c\log n}{a\log n/\sqrt{u}\log c}$$

Setting $\delta = a/(\sqrt{u}\log(c))$ we can upper bound this using Stirling's inequality by

$$\binom{4c\log n}{\delta\log n} \leq \left(\frac{(4c\log n)\cdot e}{\delta}\right)^{\delta\log n} = n^{\delta\log(4ce/\delta)}$$

Choosing u a large enough constant we can make δ and the exponent arbitrarily small. The factor of s^2 trivially only contributes a small constant to the exponent. Therefore we can bound the number of monomials by $n^{0.17}$. □

Theorem 5. *In the d-attribute model with n men and women, and $d = c\log n$ boolean attributes and weights, there is a randomized algorithm to decide if a given matching is stable in time $\tilde{O}(n^{2-1/O(c\log^2(c))})$ with error probability at most 1/3.*

Proof. We again choose $s = n^{1/uc\log^2 c}$ and construct the probabilistic polynomial as in Lemma 8. We then divide the men and women into $\lceil\frac{n}{s}\rceil$ groups of size at most s.

For a group of men $m_1,\ldots,m_s$ we let the corresponding input vector be

$$A(m_1),\ldots,A(m_s),\alpha(m_1),\ldots,\alpha(m_s),A(\mu(m_1)),\ldots,A(\mu(m_s))$$

We set X as the set of all input vectors for the $\lceil\frac{n}{s}\rceil$ groups. We define the set Y symmetrically for the input vectors corresponding to the $\lceil\frac{n}{s}\rceil$ groups of women.

Using Lemma 7 we evaluate the polynomial on all pairs $x\in X$, $y\in Y$ in time

$$\tilde{O}\left(\left(\frac{n}{s}\right)^2 + O(sd)\left(\frac{n}{s}\right)^{1.17}\right) = \tilde{O}\left(\left(\frac{n}{s}\right)^2\right) = \tilde{O}(n^{2-1/O(c\log^2(c))}) \tag{9}$$

The probability that the output is wrong for any fixed input pair is at most 1/3. We repeat this process $O(\log n)$ times and take the threshold output for every pair of inputs, such that the error probability is at most $O\left(\frac{1}{n^2}\right)$ for any fixed pair of inputs. Using a union bound we can make the probability of error at most 1/3 on any input. □

6 Conditional Hardness

6.1 Background

The Strong Exponential Time Hypothesis has proved useful in arguing conditional hardness for a large number of problems. We show SETH-hardness for both verifying and finding a stable matching in the d-attribute model, even if the weights and attributes are boolean. The main step of the proof is a reduction from the maximum inner product problem to the stable matching problem. The maximum inner product problem is known to be SETH-hard. We give the fine-grained reduction from CNFSAT to the vector orthogonality problem and from the vector orthogonality problem to the maximum inner product problem for the sake of completeness.

Definition 1 ([18, 20])**.** *The* Strong Exponential Time Hypothesis *(*SETH*) stipulates that for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a k such that k-SAT requires time $\Omega(2^{(1-\varepsilon)n})$.*

Definition 2. *For any d, the vector orthogonality problem is to decide if two input sets $U, V \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ with $|U| = |V| = n$ have a pair $u \in U$, $v \in V$ such that $\langle u, v\rangle = 0$.*

The boolean vector orthogonality problem is the variant where $U, V \subseteq \{0,1\}^d$.

Definition 3. *For any d and input l, the maximum inner product problem is to decide if two input sets $U, V \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ with $|U| = |V| = n$ have a pair $u \in U$, $v \in V$ such that $\langle u, v\rangle \geq l$.*

The boolean maximum inner product problem is the variant where $U, V \subseteq \{0,1\}^d$.

Lemma 9 ([20, 30, 3])**.** *Assuming* SETH*, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a c such that solving the boolean maximum inner product problem on $d = c \log n$ dimensions requires time $\Omega(n^{2-\varepsilon})$.*

Proof. The proof is a series of reductions from k-SAT to boolean inner product. By the Sparsification Lemma [20] we can reduce k-SAT to a subexponential number of k-SAT instances with at most $d = c_k n$ clauses, where c_k does not depend on n. Hence, assuming SETH, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a c such that CNFSAT with cn clauses requires time $\Omega(2^{(1-\varepsilon)n})$.

We reduce CNFSAT to the boolean vector orthogonality problem using a technique called *Split and List*. Divide the variable set into two sets S, T of size $\frac{n}{2}$ and for each set consider all $N = 2^{n/2}$ assignments to the variables. For every assignment we construct a d-dimensional vector where the ith position is 1 if and only if the assignment does not satisfy the ith clause of the CNF formula. Let U be the set of vectors corresponding to the assignments to S and V be the set of vectors corresponding to T. A pair $u \in U$, $v \in V$ is orthogonal if and only if the corresponding assignment satisfies all clauses. An algorithm for boolean vector orthogonality in dimension $d = cn = 2c \log N$ and time $O(N^{2-\varepsilon}) = O(2^{(1-\varepsilon/2)n})$ would contradict SETH. Hence assuming SETH, for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a c such that the boolean vector orthogonality problem with $d = c \log N$ requires time $\Omega(N^{2-\varepsilon})$.

Finally, we reduce the boolean vector orthogonality problem to the boolean maximum inner product problem by partitioning the set U into sets U_i for $0 \leq i \leq d$ where U_i contains all vectors with Hamming weight i. Observe that a vector $v \in V$ is orthogonal to a vector $u \in U_i$ if and only if $\langle u, \neg v\rangle = i$, where $\neg v$ is the element-wise complement of v. Thus U and V have an orthogonal pair, if and only if there is an i such that U_i and $\neg V = \{\neg v \mid v \in V\}$ have a pair with inner product at least i. Therefore, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a c such that the maximum inner product problem on $d = c \log N$ dimensions requires time $\Omega(N^{2-\varepsilon})$ assuming SETH. □

6.2 Finding Stable Matchings

In this subsection we give a fine-grained reduction from the maximum inner product problem to the problem of finding a stable matching in the boolean d-attribute model. This shows that the stable matching problem in the d-attribute model is SETH-hard, even if we restrict the attributes and weights to booleans.

Theorem 6. *Assuming* SETH*, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a c such that finding a stable matching in the boolean d-attribute model with $d = c \log n$ dimensions requires time $\Omega(n^{2-\varepsilon})$.*

Proof. The proof is a reduction from maximum inner product to finding a stable matching. Given an instance of the maximum inner product problem with sets $U, V \subseteq \{0,1\}^d$ where $|U| = |V| = n$ and threshold l, we construct a matching market with n men and n women. For every $u \in U$ we have a man m_u with $A(m_u) = u$ and $\alpha(m_u) = u$. Similarly, for vectors $v \in V$ we have women w_v with $A(w_v) = v$ and $\alpha(w_v) = v$. This matching market is symmetric in the sense that for m_u and w_v, $\mathrm{val}_{m_u}(w_v) = \mathrm{val}_{w_v}(m_u) = \langle u, v\rangle$.

We claim that any stable matching contains a pair (m_u, w_v) such that the inner product $\langle u, v\rangle$ is maximized. Indeed, suppose there are vectors $u \in U$, $v \in V$ with $\langle u, v\rangle \geq l$ but there exists a stable matching μ with $\langle u', v'\rangle < l$ for all pairs $(m_{u'}, w_{v'}) \in \mu$. Then (m_u, w_v) is clearly a blocking pair for μ which is a contradiction. □

6.3 Verifying Stable Matchings

In this section we give a reduction from the maximum inner product problem to the problem of verifying a stable matching, showing that this problem is also SETH-hard.

Theorem 7. *Assuming* SETH*, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a c such that verifying a stable matching in the boolean d-attribute model with $d = c \log n$ dimensions requires time $\Omega(n^{2-\varepsilon})$.*

Proof. We give a reduction from maximum inner product with sets $U, V \subseteq \{0,1\}^d$ where $|U| = |V| = n$ and threshold l. We construct a matching market with $2n$ men and women in the d'-attribute model with $d' = d + 2(l-1)$. Since $d' < 3d$ the theorem then follows immediately from the SETH-hardness of maximum inner product.

For $u \in U$, let m_u be a man in the matching market with attributes and weights $A(m_u) = \alpha(m_u) = u \circ 1^{l-1} \circ 0^{l-1}$ where we use $\circ$ for concatenation. Similarly, for $v \in V$ we have women w_v with $A(w_v) = \alpha(w_v) = v \circ 0^{l-1} \circ 1^{l-1}$. We further introduce *dummy women* w'_u for $u \in U$ with $A(w'_u) = \alpha(w'_u) = 0^d \circ 1^{l-1} \circ 0^{l-1}$ and *dummy men* m'_v for $v \in V$ with $A(m'_v) = \alpha(m'_v) = 0^d \circ 0^{l-1} \circ 1^{l-1}$.

We claim that the matching consisting of pairs (m_u, w'_u) for all $u \in U$ and (m'_v, w_v) for all $v \in V$ is stable if and only if there is no pair $u \in U$, $v \in V$ with $\langle u, v\rangle \geq l$. For $u, u' \in U$ we have $\mathrm{val}_{m_u}(w'_{u'}) = \mathrm{val}_{w'_{u'}}(m_u) = l - 1$, and for $v, v' \in V$ we have $\mathrm{val}_{w_v}(m'_{v'}) = \mathrm{val}_{m'_{v'}}(w_v) = l - 1$. In particular, any pair in μ has (symmetric) value $l-1$. Hence there is a blocking pair with respect to μ if and only if there is a pair with value at least l. For $u \neq u'$ and $v \neq v'$ the pairs $(m_u, w'_{u'})$ and $(w_v, m'_{v'})$ can never be blocking pairs as their value is $l - 1$. Furthermore for any pair of dummy nodes w'_u and m'_v we have $\mathrm{val}_{m'_v}(w'_u) = \mathrm{val}_{w'_u}(m'_v) = 0$, thus no such pair can be a blocking pair either. This leaves pairs of real nodes as the only candidates for blocking pairs. For non-dummy nodes m_u and w_v we have $\mathrm{val}_{m_u}(w_v) = \mathrm{val}_{w_v}(m_u) = \langle u, v\rangle$ so (m_u, w_v) is a blocking pair if and only if $\langle u, v\rangle \geq l$. □



Figure 1: A representation of the reduction from maximum inner product to verifying a stable matching

7 Conclusion and Open Problems

We give subquadratic algorithms for finding and verifying stable matchings in the d-attribute model and d-list model. We also show that, assuming SETH, one can only hope to find such algorithms if the number of attributes d is bounded by $O(\log n)$.

For a number of cases there is a gap between the conditional lower bound and the upper bound. Our algorithms with real attributes and weights are only subquadratic if the dimension is constant. It would be interesting to either close or explain this gap. Even for small constants our algorithm to find a stable matching is not tight, as it is not subquadratic for any $d = O(\log n)$. The techniques we use when the attributes and weights are small constants do not readily apply to the more general case.

We also lack a subquadratic time algorithm for the problem of finding a stable matching with general real attributes and weights. Even for the arbitrary 2-list case we do not currently have a subquadratic algorithm. This 2-list case seems to be a good starting place for further research.

Acknowledgment: We would like to thank Russell Impagliazzo, Vijay Vazirani, and the anonymous reviewers for helpful discussions and comments.

References

[1] Amir Abboud, Arturs Backurs, and Virginia Vassilevska Williams. Quadratic-time hardness of LCS and other sequence similarity measures. In *Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), 2015 IEEE 56th Annual Symposium on*. IEEE, 2015.

[2] Pankaj K. Agarwal, Jeff Erickson, et al. Geometric range searching and its relatives. *Contemporary Mathematics*, 223:1–56, 1999.

[3] Josh Alman and Ryan Williams. Probabilistic polynomials and hamming nearest neighbors. In *Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), 2015 IEEE 56th Annual Symposium on*. IEEE, 2015.

[4] Esther M. Arkin, Sang Won Bae, Alon Efrat, Kazuya Okamoto, Joseph S.B. Mitchell, and Valentin Polishchuk. Geometric stable roommates. *Information Processing Letters*, 109(4):219–224, 2009.

[5] Arturs Backurs and Piotr Indyk. Edit distance cannot be computed in strongly subquadratic time (unless SETH is false). In *Proceedings of the Forty-Seventh Annual ACM on Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2015, Portland, OR, USA, June 14-17, 2015*, pages 51–58, 2015.

[6] John Bartholdi and Michael A. Trick. Stable matching with preferences derived from a psychological model. *Operations Research Letters*, 5(4):165–169, 1986.

[7] Nayantara Bhatnagar, Sam Greenberg, and Dana Randall. Sampling stable marriages: why spouse-swapping won't work. In *Proceedings of the nineteenth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, pages 1223–1232. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2008.

[8] Anna Bogomolnaia and Jean-François Laslier. Euclidean preferences. *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 43(2):87–98, 2007.

[9] Karl Bringmann. Why walking the dog takes time: Fréchet distance has no strongly subquadratic algorithms unless seth fails. In *Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), 2014 IEEE 55th Annual Symposium on*, pages 661–670. IEEE, 2014.

[10] Marco L. Carmosino, Jiawei Gao, Russell Impagliazzo, Ivan Mihajlin, Ramamohan Paturi, and Stefan Schneider. Nondeterministic extensions of the strong exponential time hypothesis and consequences for non-reducibility. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM Conference on Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science*, pages 261–270. ACM, 2016.

[11] Prasad Chebolu, Leslie Ann Goldberg, and Russell Martin. The complexity of approximately counting stable matchings. In *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques*, pages 81–94. Springer, 2010.

[12] John Dabney and Brian C. Dean. Adaptive stable marriage algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 48th Annual Southeast Regional Conference*, page 35. ACM, 2010.

[13] David P. Dobkin and David G. Kirkpatrick. A linear algorithm for determining the separation of convex polyhedra. *Journal of Algorithms*, 6(3):381–392, 1985.

[14] David Gale and Lloyd S. Shapley. College admissions and the stability of marriage. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 69(1):9–15, 1962.

[15] Yannai A. Gonczarowski, Noam Nisan, Rafail Ostrovsky, and Will Rosenbaum. A stable marriage requires communication. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1003–1017. SIAM, 2015.

[16] Dan Gusfield and Robert W. Irving. *The Stable Marriage Problem: Structure and Algorithms*. Foundations of Computing Series. Mit Press, 1989.

[17] John Hershberger and Subhash Suri. A pedestrian approach to ray shooting: Shoot a ray, take a walk. *Journal of Algorithms*, 18(3):403–431, 1995.

[18] Russell Impagliazzo and Ramamohan Paturi. On the complexity of k-sat. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 62(2):367 – 375, 2001.

[19] Russell Impagliazzo, Ramamohan Paturi, and Stefan Schneider. A satisfiability algorithm for sparse depth two threshold circuits. In *Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), 2013 IEEE 54th Annual Symposium on*, pages 479–488. IEEE, 2013.

[20] Russell Impagliazzo, Ramamohan Paturi, and Francis Zane. Which problems have strongly exponential complexity? *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 63:512–530, 2001.

[21] Donald E. Knuth. *Stable marriage and its relation to other combinatorial problems: An introduction to the mathematical analysis of algorithms*, volume 10. Amer Mathematical Society, 1997.

[22] Jiří Matoušek. Efficient partition trees. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 8(1):315–334, 1992.

[23] Jiří Matoušek and Otfried Schwarzkopf. Linear optimization queries. In *Proceedings of the eighth annual symposium on Computational geometry*, pages 16–25. ACM, 1992.

[24] Cheng Ng and Daniel S. Hirschberg. Lower bounds for the stable marriage problem and its variants. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 19(1):71–77, 1990.

[25] Mihai Patrascu and Ryan Williams. On the possibility of faster SAT algorithms. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-First Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2010, Austin, Texas, USA, January 17-19, 2010*, pages 1065–1075, 2010.

[26] Alexander A. Razborov. Lower bounds on the size of bounded depth circuits over a complete basis with logical addition. *Mathematical Notes*, 41(4):333–338, 1987.

[27] Alvin E. Roth and Marilda A. Oliveira Sotomayor. *Two-sided Matching: A Study in Game - Theoretic Modeling and Analysis*. Econometric Society Monographs. Cambridge University, 1990.

[28] Ilya Segal. The communication requirements of social choice rules and supporting budget sets. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 136(1):341–378, 2007.

[29] Roman Smolensky. Algebraic methods in the theory of lower bounds for boolean circuit complexity. In *Proceedings of the nineteenth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 77–82. ACM, 1987.

[30] Ryan Williams. A new algorithm for optimal constraint satisfaction and its implications. In *Automata, Languages and Programming*, pages 1227–1237. Springer, 2004.

[31] Ryan Williams. Faster all-pairs shortest paths via circuit complexity. In *Proceedings of the 46th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 664–673. ACM, 2014.